

Remarks:

This amendment is submitted in an earnest effort to advance this case to issue without delay.

The claims have been amended to define the invention with greater particularity over the newly cited art. More specifically, the features of claims 2 and 9 and several other features have been inserted into claim 10, claim 1 has been canceled, and the remaining dependent claims have been amended to depend from claim 10.

The instant invention describes a basically S-shaped contact that is extremely small yet capable of exerting enough elastic pressure to provide a good electrical contact. Its structure is fairly specifically defined in main claim 10 and clearly differs from that of the prior art.

More specifically, newly cited US patent Masumoto shows in FIG. 1 a contact having an outer leg 43 like that of the instant invention, but its inner leg 41 projects identically from the center web as the outer web. It is not connected via a U-shaped bight and does not project toward the outer leg 43. Thus this arrangement is a simple one-sided contact that does not bear elastically on anything with its inner leg 41. Instead this inner leg 41 has an end 44 formed as a terminal. Thus at best this

reference shows half of the system of the present invention. It cannot all alone be used to reject claim 10 under §102, and there is no suggestion to bend back the leg 41 and use it for resilient contact, so that a §103 rejection on Masumoto alone is also out of the question.


US patent 5,746,626 of Kwiat has a shape vaguely similar to that of the instant invention, but the leg 40 serves to grip the support and cannot be said to be elastically deflectable. Indeed it is in solid contact with the support so that no deflection at all is possible. Thus this reference, even in combination with Masumoto, does not anticipate amended claim 10 and cannot form with Masumoto a valid §103 rejection.

The third and last applied reference, US patent 6,454,607 of Bricaud, is wholly cumulative to Masumoto. IT does not have the claimed S-shape, that is inner and outer legs extending toward each other from U-shaped bights, and in fact the left-hand contact of FIG. 6 Bricaud bears a striking resemblance to that of FIG. 1 of Masumoto. Thus Bricaud adds nothing to a rejection based on Masumoto and/or Kwiat, as clearly indicated by the two §103 rejections, both using Masumoto and one using Kwiat and the other using Bricaud.

The instant invention as defined in claim 10 is clearly different from anything shown in the art and is not suggested by the combined teachings of the art.

If only minor problems that could be corrected by means of a telephone conference stand in the way of allowance of this case, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned to make the necessary corrections.

Respectfully submitted,  
The Firm of Karl F. Ross P.C.

  
by: Andrew Wilford, 26,597  
Attorney for Applicant

04 August 2005  
5676 Riverdale Avenue Box 900  
Bronx, NY 10471-0900  
Cust. No.: 535  
Tel: (718) 884-6600  
Fax: (718) 601-1099

Enclosure:                      None